

ITAC Court Core Data Transfer Project Meeting Notes

August 9, 2004

These notes will be followed by a more structured Status Report posted later this week.

Mr. Dave Kennamer initiated the meeting with a review of the purpose of these work sessions and more specifically the high lights from the last work session. We will ask Mr. Greg Hale to place the slides from his excellent discussion last week on the JUSTIS Virtual Office.

Mr. Dan Cipullo led the court discussions with an examination of the age of data that will be converted. Court data extends back to 1978. The questions raised included:

- Will all court data be converted
- Can / how would “old” data be updated
- Should each agency have a copy of converted data
- How would the court archive be structured / accessed

There was a great deal of discussion regarding whether copies of converted data should be maintained by agencies. While an agency has business processes that require compilations and aggregations of data, and individual summaries for both analysis and classification activities, many participants felt that “one true copy” of data must be a constant and the courts archive should serve that purpose. Prior to a finalization of this discussion, the courts will need to define the archive they will maintain, the data therein, access methodologies and the ability of an agency to utilize that archive. This discussion led to an assignment for the courts for the next work session. See “Assignments”.

Mr. Cipullo also mentioned two other issues:

- Maintenance responsibility of CHRI by the courts
- Charge Code standardization

The courts will encourage, and support, the use of the DC Tracking Number so that all portions of a criminal cycle can be joined to form a complete record of activity. Dan does not feel it is appropriate for a judicial agency to be a de facto Central Repository. This issue was studied, in detail, by a prior ITAC Legislative Working Group. JUSTIS staff will be asked to make that document available. See Assignments.

Dan initiated a discussion of standardization of charge codes. While there was general support for such an effort, there was any number of questions. The moderator asked that the discussion not be addressed as an issue for the CCDT Working Group inasmuch as it might distract from completing our work within our aggressive schedule. The discussion of charge codes will continue, it is certain.

The courts also indicated that electronic transfer of documents, to and from the court, are to be included in this Working Group's work product. As a consequence, both the courts and the agencies will include "document" as a data transfer / input media.

The discussions created an opportunity to define work products for next week's work session. They include:

(**Note** – please bring a minimum of two copies of all work products; one for your use and one to be turned in to the work session moderator for Working Group records. Some work products, identified by "copies for work group" should be provided to all participants. It appears that 25 copies will be normally sufficient.)

ASSIGNMENTS:

Agencies:

- 1) Please identify any archive files maintained by the agency which contain / duplicates "old" court data.
- 2) Please identify, by year, the data the agency would require the courts convert and make available to the agency for each type of charge listed below. Also include whether the data would represent only convictions or all cases. Please expand the "charge type" as necessary.

Types:

DC misdemeanors
Traffic
US misdemeanors
Felonies
SP / Fugitive

- 3) Please include DC Tracking Number in the data identified to be made available by the courts.
- 4) Please provide for input and maintenance of the DC Tracking Number in the agency data base.
- 5) Please provide for the DC Tracking Number to be passed to the courts as agency input as both data and document transfer.
- 6) Please list the agency business processes which require court data. Copies for work group. (An excellent example of how to present this information was offered by the USAO and is found on the Virtual Office as "T.1 USAO Court Process Chart")
- 7) Please list the data requirements for each business process identified. (An excellent format for this listing is an Excel work sheet offered by CSOSA, identified on the Virtual Office as "T.1 CIS Data Field Definition Chart")
- 8) Please include, as additional columns or in the comments as appropriate:
 - the best delivery method – for example "push as data", "electronic transfer of document", paper document, etc.
 - the best timing of the delivery.

- 9) Please make a “wish list” using the chart identified above, of data which the agency currently does not receive from the courts (and/or such court data obtained from third parties). Please identify such data as either “mission critical” or “desirable” in the comments column.
- 10) Please provide a master list of all data identified in the above exercises. Please identify “wish list” data by utilization of colors or fonts types differentiating this data from data currently received. Copies for work group.

Courts:

- 1) Please define “archive”. Copies for work group.
- 2) Please list the court business processes which require agency data. Copies for work group. (An excellent example of how to present this information was offered by the USAO and is found on the Virtual Office as “**T.1 USAO Court Process Chart**”)
- 3) Please list the data requirements for each business process identified. (An excellent format for this listing is an Excel work sheet offered by CSOSA, identified on the Virtual Office as “**T.1 CIS Data Field Definition Chart**”)
- 4) Please include, as additional columns or in the comments as appropriate:
 - a. the best delivery method – for example “push as data”, “electronic transfer of document”, paper document, etc.
 - b. the best timing of the delivery.
- 5) Please make a “wish list” using the chart identified above, of data which the court currently does not receive from the agencies (and/or such agency data obtained from third parties). Please identify such data as either “mission critical” or “desirable” in the comments column.
- 6) Please provide a master list of all data identified in the above exercises. Please identify “wish list” data by utilization of colors or fonts types differentiating this data from data currently received. Copies for work group.

JUSTIS Staff

- 1) Provide a copy of the study completed by the ITAC Legislation working Group which addresses the issue of CHRI and a Central Repository.
- 2) Provide a copy of a portion of the charge code table developed in a neighboring state.

The next CCDT working Group session will be August 16, in the OAG conference room in the north east corner of the 10th floor of Judiciary Square, 441 4th street, NW, from 10:00 – 12:00.